UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

APPLE INC., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD, SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., and GOOGLE INC.
Petitioners,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,
Patent Owner.

_____

Case CBM2015-00031[1]

Patent 8,336,772 B2

_____

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

[1] Samsung's challenge to claims 5 and 10 of US Patent No. 8,336,772 B2 ("the '772 patent") in CBM2015-00059 was consolidated with this proceeding. Paper 24, 9. Google's challenge to claims 1, 5, and 10 of the '772 patent in CBM2015-00132 was consolidated with this proceeding. Paper 31, 11; Paper 37, 2–3.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Board's final written decision in this covered business method patent review misapprehends the Federal Circuit's and Supreme Court's guidance on patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and overlooks the Federal Circuit's decision in *Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 2015-2044 (Fed. Cir. May 12, 2016). The challenged claims are directed to a novel content delivery system for distributing digital content over the Internet while reducing piracy—a pressing problem at the time of invention. Like the claims at issue in *Enfish*, *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245, 125 (Fed. Cir. 2014), *Apple, Inc. v. Mirror World Techs., LLC*, Case CBM2016-00019 (Paper 12 May 26, 2016), and *Google Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.*, Case CBM2015-0040 (Paper 9, June 24, 2015), the inventions improve the functioning of computers by teaching improved devices and methods for downloading, storing, and accessing data. "[T]he focus of the claims is on the specific asserted improvement in computer capabilities" – not an "'abstract idea' for which computers are invoked merely as a tool." *Enfish*, slip op. at 11. Whether considered at step one or step two of the *Alice* inquiry, the claims' specific techniques put them squarely in the realm of patent-eligible subject matter.

The Board failed to address the claim language and the specific limitations governing organization and processing of specific data types. By characterizing the claims as "directed to performing the fundamental economic practice of

conditioning and controlling access to content based on, for example, payment," the Board "describe[d] the claims at . . . a high level of abstraction and untethered from the language of the claims," thereby "all but ensur[ing] that the exceptions to § 101 swallow the rule." *Enfish*, slip op. at 9; *see also Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347, 2354 (2014) (warning against "construing this exclusionary principle [to] swallow all of patent law"). Patent Owner respectfully requests rehearing to correct these errors. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d).

I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Patent Owner requests that the Board reverse its original decision (Paper 45, May 26, 2016) and hold that challenged claims 1, 5, 8, and 10 of the '772 Patent are patent eligible.

II. BACKGROUND

1. Distribution of digital content over the Internet "introduces a problem that does not arise" with content distributed on physical media. *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245, 125 (Fed. Cir. 2014). By the late 1990s, improved data compression and increasing bandwidth for Internet access enabled content providers, for the first time, to offer content data for purchase over the Internet; at the same time, unprotected data files could be easily pirated and made available "essentially world-wide." Ex. 1201, 1:35-36. Conventional operation of

the Internet does not solve the problem of data piracy: on the contrary, the Internet facilitates the distribution of data without restriction or protection. *Id.* 1:52-58.

Content providers had faced piracy before—a CD can be copied onto another CD and the pirated copy sold—but the problem presented by distribution of pirated content over the Internet was unprecedented. There had never before been a way to make free, identical, and flawless copies of physical media available to millions of people instantaneously at virtually no incremental cost. *See generally Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 929-30 (2005). The Internet gave rise to an urgent need to address data piracy associated with digital content distribution over the Internet.

The inventor devised a system for downloading and paying for data, described in the specification and claimed in this patent and others, comprising specific elements designed to overcome problems inherent in making digital content available over the Internet and in accessing that content. Ex. 1201, at 1. The relevant claims are directed to two aspects of that system: a "handheld multimedia terminal" *id.* 25:64-65, and "a data access terminal." *id.* 27:15-17.

Claim 1 requires the "handheld multimedia terminal" to includes specific hardware elements (e.g., a "wireless interface"; "non-volatile memory"; a "display"; and a "processor") and code comprising, among other things: (1) code to request and receive identifier data; (2) code to display one or more items of

DOCKET ALARM

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.